

RECEIVED

1 APR 22 1996

**From:** Rick Gibson <rag3@greenepa.net>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/19/96 10:39pm  
**Subject:** Internet phone (voice)

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I am opposed to the regulation of Internet communication involving transmission of the voice via existing Internet links. I realize if this were permitted it would be a profound blow to the various phone companies. My families phone bill is often in excess of 100\$. Our total family income is roughly in the range of 30-40000 a year. Our phone bill is a substantial burden. Since PCs are not in that many households at this time, the phone companies would have some time to adjust and compensate for this technological change. I guess in reaching a decision it would probably be reasonable to consider the impact in terms of lost jobs etc. to the total savings of the customers.

-- Thank you for your time.....  
MZ=90

No. of Copies rec'd  
List AOCIF

RECEIVED

**From:** Dr. Q <JQuattle@ix.netcom.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/20/96 12:29pm  
**Subject:** Internet Phone regulation

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 22 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

As a U.S. citizen, I strongly urge you NOT to regulate the development and use of "internet phone" software.  
James Quattlebaum  
Gold River, CA  
916-229-3182

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
LW:KCC:4

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

**From:** Richard Wang <hwang@baldwinw.edu>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/20/96 3:50pm

APR 22 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Hi:

In the market, there are some Hands Free speakerphone, which has a cigarette lighter adaptor to connect to car cigarette plug and a snap-in connector to connect cellular phone. Is this a FCC regulated item ?

Thanks,

Contact: fh894@cleveland.freenet.edu (Richard Wang)  
P.O.Box 532, Berea, Ohio 44017-0532 USA PH/FAX: 216 891 9358

---

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ASOC \_\_\_\_\_

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL RECEIVED

**From:** John Navas <JNavas@navasgrp.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/20/96 7:04pm  
**Subject:** Comment on ACTA Internet Phone Petition

APR 22 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: RM No. 8775

We respectfully submit that the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") should reject the petition of America's Carriers Telecommunication Association ("ACTA") for the following reasons:

1. This is not a "new technology" - the transmission of digitally-encoded voice is well-established and widely used; e.g., conferencing, voice-annotation, and voice-mail systems. The only thing that is new is the convenience and low-cost of the latest products, but that does not change the nature of the fundamental technology.
2. The quality of digitally-encoded voice over the Internet is fundamentally different from a conventional switched voice call, which provides a dedicated clear channel. Digitally-encoded voice over the Internet on the other hand is a space-available packet technology, which is subject to unpredictable delays and interruptions. It is effectively nothing more than fast voice-mail.
3. The claim that there is "virtually no charge" for traffic, that it is being "given away," and that it deprives the telecommunications infrastructure of revenue is completely false and without foundation. Commercial users of the Internet now pay the cost of their use of it, not just software that drives it, including the regulated telecommunications services that are used to carry Internet traffic, digitally-encoded voice included.
4. Any distinction between digitally-encoded voice and other forms of digital data would be entirely arbitrary, and difficult, if not impossible, to enforce. Data is data.
5. The FCC already sufficiently regulates these transmissions by regulating the carriers that are providing the underlying telecommunications service.
  - a) Regulation of "providers of software," which do not directly provide any telecommunications service, would be a substantial and unwarranted expansion of FCC authority. That logic would have the FCC also regulate virtually every other computer product company.
  - b) Regulation of the Internet itself would be a substantial expansion of FCC authority, since that would be a regulation of content, rather than just the transmission medium (which is already regulated). To do so would be a serious and unwarranted invasion of privacy, which might well be unconstitutional.
6. There is no comparison between the cable television industry and digitally-encoded voice over the Internet. The former are clearly common carriers; the Internet is merely an association of users of common carriers, not a common carrier itself. Regulation of the Internet would therefore amount to regulation of users of telecommunications, which would also be a substantial and unwarranted expansion of FCC authority.
7. The claim that the capacity of the Internet needs to be protected from digitally-encoded voice traffic is disingenuous at best. The Internet continues to expand to meet demand, buying more services from regulated telecommunications carriers. Furthermore, there is no foundation for a suggestion that any one form of traffic is better or worse than another, and there is no outcry from users of the Internet.
8. The amount of digitally-encoded voice traffic over the Internet as compared to conventional voice telephony is insignificant, and likely to remain so for the foreseeable future. There is absolutely no evidence to support the claim of "serious economic hardship" (which is directly at odds with the claim that the Internet needs to be protected from digitally-encoded voice traffic due to limited capacity). Hence there is no need or justification for any immediate action.
9. Adding major new regulations would be contrary to the deregulation policies adopted by the Federal Government and the FCC itself, particularly in the absence of any real showing of serious need.
10. Digitally-encoded voice over the Internet is exactly the kind of value-added free-market innovation that the FCC

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

should be encouraging by noninterference.

Sincerely,  
John Navas  
Lauren Navas  
11901 W. VOMAC ROAD  
DUBLIN, CA 94568-1050  
VOICE: 510-828-6764  
FAX: 510-828-6763

RECEIVED

**From:** Alex Kashko <Alex@galdr.demon.co.uk>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/21/96 8:30am  
**Subject:** Voice communication over Internet

APR 22 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Sir

I wish to protest the efforts of ACTA to ban the sale of equipment to allow internet users to make long distance phone calls cheaply.

Phone calls, especially long distance ones, are vastly over priced. It costs a provider no more to connect to a distant country than to the house next door. The only cost that can be associated with an individual call is the cost of printing the number on the bill. Calls should be sold for a flat rate monthly fee allowing world wide telephone access.

Any such ban would constitute a blockage on free trade, be restricted only to the US. keeping US costs up and reducing competitiveness, and lead to a black market in such equipment.

Not being currently in the US I am unable to submit formal comments.

\*\*\*\*\*

-- Alex Kashko BSc, MSc, PhD : Poet, writer and multimedia programmer.  
Mindsources: A free news letter, Your personal internet librarian and your classified ad each week. Mindsources Librarians get paid to find information and build a network of contacts. Mail minder@galdr.demon.co.uk for details

No. of Copies Rec'd  
List A&CDE

RECEIVED

1 APR 22 1996

**From:** Daniel J. Partridge <unlimit@goodnet.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/21/96 4:28pm  
**Subject:** re: RM No. 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The only reason for persons to be bothered (companies rather!) with the issues of vocal interaction on the internet is to secure their profits.

The same argument could be made for monitoring electric/solar vehicles, etc. by the oil/gas industries.

Just my \$0.02

Daniel J. Partridge  
President  
Unlimited Software Consulting, Inc.  
Phoenix, AZ

Number of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
FBI ASCCDF

RECEIVED

APR 22 1996

**From:** Kairoff, Josh <JOSHK@imtech.com>  
**To:** 'fcc i' <rm8775@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 4/21/96 7:27pm  
**Subject:** Internet Phone

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Sirs:

I use the Internet phone to keep in touch with friends and families members that I otherwise would not be able to. Any regulations that would effect this would be a shame.

The phone companies should use competition, not regulation to keep there customers.

Josh Kairoff.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_



**From:** <smearns@wspice.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/22/96 12:43am  
**Subject:** RM No. 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Please vote on the side of progress, individuals and the people by turning down the ACTA petition.

RECEIVED

Thank you,  
Steve Mearns  
Steve Mearns smearns@wspice.com or  
Susan Mcshan Mearns smcshan@worldnet.att.net

1 APR 22 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

**From:** William Leming <willy@enter.net>  
**To:** A20.A20(kwerbach)  
**Date:** 4/21/96 7:30am  
**Subject:** ACTA

APR 22 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Gentlemen,

I think it is terrible unfair for you to fight against the Internet type phones. We are not using telephone lines. We are just a group of people with varying life styles who like to learn about different people. Please leave us alone !!!!  
Thank you,

Number of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_